



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/086,603	02/28/2002	Anita Orhand	PF010026	1956

7590 12/29/2005

JOSEPH S. TRIPOLI
THOMSON MULTIMEDIA LICENSING INC.
2 INDEPENDENCE WAY
P.O. BOX 5312
PRINCETON, NJ 08543-5312

EXAMINER

SENGI, BEHROOZ M

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2613

DATE MAILED: 12/29/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

<p align="center">Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief</p>	Application No. 10/086,603	Applicant(s) ORHAND ET AL.	
	Examiner Behrooz Senfi	Art Unit 2613	

--The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

THE REPLY FILED 02 December 2005 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE.

1. ☒ The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on the same day as filing a Notice of Appeal. To avoid abandonment of this application, applicant must timely file one of the following replies: (1) an amendment, affidavit, or other evidence, which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in compliance with 37 CFR 41.31; or (3) a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114. The reply must be filed within one of the following time periods:

- a) ☒ The period for reply expires 4 months from the mailing date of the final rejection.
 b) ☐ The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection.

Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f).

Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

NOTICE OF APPEAL

2. ☐ The Notice of Appeal was filed on _____. A brief in compliance with 37 CFR 41.37 must be filed within two months of the date of filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal. Since a Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed within the time period set forth in 37 CFR 41.37(a).

AMENDMENTS

3. ☐ The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will not be entered because
 (a) ☐ They raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);
 (b) ☐ They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below);
 (c) ☐ They are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or
 (d) ☐ They present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims.

NOTE: _____. (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).

4. ☐ The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121. See attached Notice of Non-Compliant Amendment (PTOL-324).
 5. ☐ Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): _____.
 6. ☐ Newly proposed or amended claim(s) _____ would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the non-allowable claim(s).
 7. ☒ For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) ☐ will not be entered, or b) ☒ will be entered and an explanation of how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended.
 The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:
 Claim(s) allowed: _____.
 Claim(s) objected to: 18.
 Claim(s) rejected: 1-17, 19 and 20.
 Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: _____.

AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE

8. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but before or on the date of filing a Notice of Appeal will not be entered because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and sufficient reasons why the affidavit or other evidence is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).
 9. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing a Notice of Appeal, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will not be entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to overcome all rejections under appeal and/or appellant fails to provide a showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 41.33(d)(1).
 10. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation of the status of the claims after entry is below or attached.

REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER

11. ☐ The request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: _____.
 12. ☐ Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s). (PTO/SB/08 or PTO-1449) Paper No(s). _____.
 13. ☐ Other: Please, see enclosed response to arguments.

Response to Arguments

1. Applicant's arguments filed 12/2/2005 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

With respect to claim 1, Applicant asserts (remarks, page 8, lines 13 – 18) that Katata neither discloses nor suggests a process wherein, mixed blocks straddling two zones of different resolution are detected, and the zone corresponding to each pixel of these mixed blocks is determined so as to construct mixed block by allocating the resolution of this specified zone to this pixel to get constructed mixed blocks and to code the constructed mixed blocks.

Examiner respectfully disagrees.

Katata teaches (col. 12, lines 31 – 44) detection of mixed state/block of pixels in the boundary of the image, and the zone corresponding to each pixel of these mixed blocks is determined by pixel weighted value.

With respect to claims 2, 11 – 17, Applicant asserts (remarks, page 11) that Li similarly to Katata neither discloses nor suggests a process wherein, mixed blocks straddling two zones of different resolution are detected, and the zone corresponding to each pixel of these mixed blocks is determined so as to construct mixed block by allocating the resolution of this specified zone to this pixel to get constructed mixed blocks and to code the constructed mixed blocks. Applicant's arguments are noted. However, it is noted that the Li reference is a secondary reference, used to make obvious various known versions of MPEG as claimed. Hence, it was not relied upon to solely teach a process wherein, mixed blocks straddling two zones of different

resolution are detected, and the zone corresponding to each pixel of these mixed blocks is determined so as to construct mixed block by allocating the resolution of this specified zone to this pixel to get constructed mixed blocks and to code the constructed mixed blocks as asserted. Therefore, the argument with respect to Li has no merit.


Applicants arguments with respect to claim 7 (remarks, page 13) is a repeat made earlier in claim 1. Thus, it has been addressed.

With respect to claim 4, Applicant asserts (remarks, page 15 that, Jiang, similarly to Katata, neither disclose nor suggest a process wherein, mixed blocks straddling two zones of different resolution are detected, and the zone corresponding to each pixel of these mixed blocks is determined so as to construct mixed block by allocating the resolution of this specified zone to this pixel to get constructed mixed blocks and to code the constructed mixed blocks. Applicant's arguments are noted. However, it is noted that the Jiang reference is a secondary reference, used to make obvious a "residual" claimed. Hence, it was not relied upon to solely teach a process wherein, mixed blocks straddling two zones of different resolution are detected, and the zone corresponding to each pixel of these mixed blocks is determined so as to construct mixed block by allocating the resolution of this specified zone to this pixel to get constructed mixed blocks and to code the constructed mixed blocks as asserted. Therefore, the argument with respect to Jiang has no merit.

Applicant asserts (remarks, page 14, lines 6 – 8) that the admitted prior art, in particular fig. 1, discloses allocating to each pixel of the mixed block the resolution of its corresponding zone. However, examiner fails to find support for such assertion.

Art Unit: 2613

In view of the reasons as stated above, the previous rejection of claims 1 – 17, 19 and 20 is maintained.


VU LE
PRIMARY EXAMINER